1	Semnar & Hartman, LLP		
2	Babak Semnar, Esq. (#224890) bob@sandiegoconsumerattorneys.com		
3	Jared M. Hartman (#254860)		
4	jared@sandiegoconsumerattorneys.com		
5	400 S. Melrose Drive, Suite 209 Vista, California 92081		
6	Telephone: (951) 293-4187		
7	Fax: (888) 819-8230		
8 9	Attorneys for Plaintiff, CAMILLE MCKINNEY		
	U.S. DISTRICT COURT		
10	SOUTHERN DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	CAMILLE MCKINNEY, an individual	Case No.: <u>'16CV1215 BEN JLB</u>	
12	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES	
13		AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL FOR VIOLATIONS OF:	
14	V.	TOR VIOLATIONS OF.	
15	SECURE CAPITAL MANAGEMENT,	1. FEDERAL FAIR DEBT	
16	INC.; ACE CASH EXPRESS, INC.; and DOES 1-10;	COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.;	
17	and Dobb 1 10,	2. STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
18	Defendant.	ROSENTHAL ACT, CALIF. CIV. CODE § 1788, et seq.;	
19		3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 -	
20			
21			
22	Plaintiff, CAMILLE MCKINNEY, an Individual, by and through her attorneys of		
23	record, hereby complains and alleges as follows:		
24	INTRODUCTION		
25	1. Plaintiff, by and through her attorneys of record, brings this action to		
$\begin{bmatrix} 25 \\ 26 \end{bmatrix}$	secure redress from unlawful debt collection practices engaged in by Defendants		
$\frac{20}{27}$	SECURE CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, INC. (hereinafter "SECURE") and ACE CASH		
$\begin{bmatrix} 27 \\ 28 \end{bmatrix}$	EXPRESS, INC. (hereinafter "ACE") in violation of the Federal Fair Debt Collection		
ا تا∟	I and the second		

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692-1692p (hereinafter "FDCPA") and the State of California Rosenthal Act, California Civil Code § 1788-1788.32 (hereinafter "Rosenthal" or "Rosenthal Act").

- 2. Plaintiff makes the allegations below on information and belief, with the exception of those allegations that pertain to Plaintiff personally, or to Plaintiff's counsel, which Plaintiff alleges on personal knowledge.
- 3. While many violations are described below with specificity, this Complaint alleges violations of the statutes cited in their entirety.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. This action arises out of Defendants' violations of the Federal FDCPA, over which the U.S. District Court has original subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1681p. The U.S. District Court has supplemental jurisdiction over all state law causes of action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).
- 5. Because Defendants SECURE and ACE both regularly conduct business within the State of California by purposefully contacting California residents for purposes of debt collection, and because both maintain an agent for service of process located within the State of California, personal jurisdiction is established.
- 6. Venue in this District is proper pursuant for the following reasons: (i) Plaintiff resides in the County of San Diego, State of California, which is within this judicial district; (ii) the conduct complained of herein occurred within this judicial district; and, (iii) Defendants have both conducted business within this judicial district at all times relevant.

PARTIES & DEFINITIONS

- 7. Plaintiff is a natural person whose permanent residences is in the County of San Diego, State of California, and is therefore a "person" as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(g) of the Rosenthal Act.
- 8. Plaintiff, as a natural person allegedly obligated to pay a consumer debt to Defendants, alleged to have been due and owing, is therefore both a "consumer" as that

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3) of the FDCPA, and a "debtor" as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(h) of the Rosenthal Act.

- As a partnership, corporation, limited liability company, or other similar entity, Defendants therefore are "persons" within the meaning of California Civil Code § 1788.2(g) of the Rosenthal Act.
- 10. Defendant SECURE alleged that they were collecting upon an allegedly defaulted personal payday loan, which Plaintiff allegedly incurred by utilizing the line of credit issued to her for everyday purchases in her daily personal life. Therefore, Plaintiff is informed and believes that the money alleged to have been owed to Defendants originated from monetary credit that was extended primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, and is therefore a "debt" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5) of the FDCPA and California Civil Code § 1788.2(d) of the Rosenthal Act.
- 11. Therefore, the money that Defendants were attempting to collect was a "consumer credit transaction" within the meaning of California Civil Code § 1788.2(e) of the Rosenthal Act.
- 12. Because Plaintiff, a natural person allegedly obligated to pay money arising from what Plaintiff is informed and believes was a consumer credit transaction, the money allegedly owed was a "consumer debt" within the meaning of California Civil Code § 1788.2(f) of the Rosenthal Act.
- 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant SECURE utilizes the instrumentalities of interstate commerce and the mails in a business for which the principal purpose is the collection of any debts; regularly collects or attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another or themselves; and is therefore a "debt collector" within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6) of the FDCPA and California Civil Code § 1788.2(c) of the Rosenthal Act, and thereby engages in "debt collection" within the meaning of California Civil Code § 1788.2(b) of the Rosenthal Act.

14.

7

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

24 25

23

26

27

28

Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant ACE regularly collects or attempts to collect, debts on its own behalf; and is therefore a "debt collector" within the meaning of California Civil Code § 1788.2(c) of the Rosenthal Act, and thereby engages in "debt collection" within the meaning of California Civil Code § 1788.2(b) of the Rosenthal Act.

15. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that at all times herein mentioned each of the Defendant was the agent, servant, employee, or partner of each of the remaining defendants and, in committing the acts and omissions hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency, employment, partnership, or other business relationship, and were each responsible for the acts and omissions alleged in this complaint.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 16. Sometime in 2015, Plaintiff fell behind in her schedule of monthly payments owed to ACE upon a line of personal credit issued to her by ACE as a "payday loan", whereby Plaintiff allegedly incurred this debt owed to ACE for her to use in her everyday life for normal every day purchases.
- After falling behind in her payments, Defendant ACE retained the services 17. of Defendant SECURE to collect the monthly payments upon its behalf.
- 18. Upon information and belief, the agreement between Defendant ACE and Defendant SECURE is one of agency, whereby SECURE is acting on behalf of, at the direction of, and in association with Defendant ACE in its efforts to collect on behalf of ACE.
- 19. On or about May 10, 2016, Plaintiff placed a telephone call to ACE to inquire about their relationship with SECURE, and the agent with whom Plaintiff spoke specifically informed her that the account is "in collections" and ACE cannot accept any payments from Plaintiff upon the account as all payments must go through their collections agency, and the agent also affirmed that any payment provided to the

collections agent will be paid to ACE and the balance will be reduced.

- 20. Therefore, it is clear that ACE and SECURE have been engaged in an agency relationship and that SECURE is, at all relevant times, acting on behalf of, at the direction of, and in association with Defendant ACE in its efforts to collect on behalf of ACE.
- 21. Consequently, any actions taken by SECURE in its efforts to collect upon the instant account are as if ACE had taken the actions on its own, and any violations by SECURE as the agent flow through to ACE as the principal via vicarious liability.
- 22. Sometime at the end of February 2016, Plaintiff had a telephone conversation with an employee of SECURE to inquire as to the balance owed upon the account.
- 23. Immediately after the employee verified her name identification as the alleged obligor upon the account, the employee launched into an unprovoked tirade of cursing and name-calling directed towards Plaintiff, and called her such derogatory and offensive things as "Fucking Bitch" and asking her if she knows that he "relies on opiates" and she is making his job harder by not making payments and that she needs to make payments.
- 24. When Plaintiff called back and complained to a supervisor, the supervisor attempted to apologize by explaining that the employee is under medical care.
- 25. Sometime thereafter, in April 2016, Plaintiff had another telephone conversation with what sounded like a different employee of SECURE, and this employee accused Plaintiff of lying about the cursing incident and claims he listened to the recorded calls from that phone conversation and the cursing incident never happened.
- 26. This employee in April 2016 further attempted to shame and degrade Plaintiff by asking rhetorically, "Is this what you do with all of your other bills?"
- 27. When this employee further pressed Plaintiff for her debit card information to make a payment over the phone, Plaintiff protested about giving her debit card

6

9

1213

1415

16

17

1819

21 22

20

23

2425

26

27

28

information to people she no longer trusts, and the employee refused to provide her with a mailing address for mail-payments and claimed that they only accept debit card payments.

- 28. As a result of the debt collectors cursing at her, yelling at her, shaming her, and degrading her, Plaintiff has suffered concrete harm by way of mental anguish such as fear, depression, loss of self-worth, feelings of despair and hopelessness, loss of sleep, and anxiety.
- 29. The concrete harm described above is directly attributable to Defendants, as the harm was caused as a result of SECURE's employees' statements to her, as taken on behalf of, at the direction of, and in association with ACE.
- 30. Plaintiff seeks redress for this harm, which is able to be obtained through the civil lawsuit process, by way of actual damages being awarded to her for suffering such harm.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATIONS OF FDCPA, AS AGAINST DEFENDANT SECURE ONLY 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692-1692p

- 31. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs, as though set forth fully herein.
- 32. By cursing at Plaintiff, yelling at her, and shaming and degrading her by accusing her of lying and asking if this is what she does with all of her debts, and Defendant's employees did so with the intention of scaring Plaintiff into paying the outstanding debt, Defendant committed the following violations of the Federal FDCPA:
 - a. Engaged in conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d, and
 - b. Engaged in unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect

any debt in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692f of the FDCPA.

33. As a result of these violations, Plaintiff has suffered concrete harm by way of mental anguish such as fear, depression, loss of self-worth, feelings of despair and hopelessness, loss of sleep, and anxiety.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATIONS OF ROSENTHAL ACT AS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 1788-1788.32

- 34. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs, as though set forth fully herein.
- 35. By violating the FDCPA, as identified the First Cause of Action above, Defendant SECURE also necessarily violated the Rosenthal Act via Calif. Civil Code § 1788.17, as the Rosenthal Act has incorporated each of those provisions of the FDCPA.
- 36. Because ACE and SECURE are engaged in an agency relationship and that SECURE is, at all relevant times, acting on behalf of, at the direction of, and in association with Defendant ACE in its efforts to collect on behalf of ACE, then any actions taken by SECURE in its efforts to collect upon the instant account are as if ACE had taken the actions on its own, and any violations by SECURE as the agent flow through to ACE as the principal via vicarious liability.
- 37. As a result of these violations, Plaintiff has suffered concrete harm by way of mental anguish such as fear, depression, loss of self-worth, feelings of despair and hopelessness, loss of sleep, and anxiety.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants, and Plaintiff be awarded damages as follows:

• An award of statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. \$ 1692k(a)(2)(A);

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

1	•	An award of actual damages of \$55,000.00, or as the jury may award,		
2		pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);		
3	•	An award of costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to		
4		15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3);		
5	•	An award of statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code §		
6		1788.30(b);		
7	•	An additional award of statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15		
8		U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A), as incorporated into the Rosenthal Act via Calif.		
9	Civ. Code §1788.17, which is cumulative and in addition to all other			
10		remedies pursuant to California	Civil Code § 1788.32;	
11	•	An award of actual damages	of \$55,000.00, or as the jury may award,	
12		pursuant to California Civil Code § 1788.30(a);		
13	•	An award of costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to		
14		Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c).		
15	Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of			
16	America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and hereby demands, a trial by jury.			
17	Dated: Ma	y 19, 2016	Respectfully submitted,	
18			SEMNAR & HARTMAN, LLP	
19		D.		
20		By:	<u>/s/ Jared M. Hartman</u> Jared M. Hartman, Esq.	
21			Attorneys for Plaintiff	
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28			8	
	I		o	